

REMARKS

Claims 1–17 and 21–22 are pending for examination with claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 17, and 21 being independent claims. Applicant has amended no claims and no new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1–17, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,946 to Diffie et al. [hereinafter Diffie] in view of O'SHEA, et al., Child-proof Authentication for MIPv6 (CAM), vol. 31, no. 2, ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communications Review, April 2001, pages 4–8 [hereinafter Greg]. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as follows.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Diffie does not teach or suggest a network device having a portion derived from the public key of the computing device. However, Applicant disagrees that Greg may be combined with Diffie to cure this deficiency since Greg is not prior art as defined by 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103. Specifically, the Office action misstates the publication date of the Greg reference as January–February 2000. However, the correct date of the Greg reference is April 2001, as noted above. The date of the Greg reference is not prior art under § 102(b) since it was not published more than one year prior to the application date of November 13, 2001.

Since the Examiner agrees that Diffie does not teach all the features of claims 1–17, 21, and 22 (e.g., a network address having a portion derived from the public key of the computing device), and Applicant shows that Greg is not prior art to be combined

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

with Diffie, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1–17, 21, and 22 under § 103.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1–17 and 21–22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112¶1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the claims are rejected as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows:

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 17, and 21

Claim 1 recites “a network address ... usable to route a message to the first computing device” The Office action states that the phrase “usable to route a message to the first computing device” is not supported by the specification, and suggests that the specification does not indicate how the first computing device uses a network address of the first computing device. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Initially, as noted in Applicant’s prior response, a network address is *defined* by its function to identify and route a message (i.e., the Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th ed., Microsoft Press, 2002, defines a network address as a “name or token specifying a particular computer or site on the Internet or other network” or as “a code used to specify an email destination.”). The functional definition of a network address is well known in the art, and defines that a network address is usable to route a message. If the Examiner would prefer a declaration from one or more of the inventor’s as to the

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

knowledge in the art, Applicant requests that the Examiner call the undersigned attorney to request such a declaration.

Moreover, claim 1 does not recite that the first computing device actually *routes* a message to the second computing device based on the network address. Rather, the language in the claim defines what a network address is, and distinguishes the network address from other portions of a message, such as the body or other header information.

In addition, Applicant's specification as filed states in paragraph [0004] "In network communications, an often used form of identity is the network address used by a device to identify itself on the network. Messages are typically tagged with this form of identity [i.e., network address], which can be used by a recipient to address a message in response." Thus, the specification states that network address is usable to route (e.g., used by a recipient to address a message in response) a message as recited in claim 1.

In addition, Applicant's specification at paragraph [0029] states "The router allows the devices on the LAN to communicate over an internetwork 206 to remote computing devices such as device 208. The Internet is one example of an internetwork. Any of the devices, including the router, in Figure 2 may send a message to any other device. In protocols typically used today, the message contains the network address of the sender (the "from address") and the network address of the recipient ("to address"). Moreover, Applicant's specification at paragraph [0032] states "the PKD [Public Key-Derived] address is an address of the computing device 100. ... The first part, called the route prefix 308, contains a routable address that can be used to route a message to an appropriate network link. ... For details on how this works on an IPv6 network, see the IETF RFC 2462 'IPv6 Stateless Address Autoconfiguration.'" In this manner, the

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

specification recites one example of a network address as an IPv6 address which “can be used to route a message”. Routing based on the example IPv6 address is known in the art through the published IPv6 routing protocols. Accordingly, the network address may be usable to route a message as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under § 112¶1 be withdrawn. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 17, and 21 each contain a similar recitation of “usable to route a message” as recited in claim 1, and are patentable for at least the foregoing reasons. Dependent claims 12–16 depend from claim 11 and dependent claim 22 depends from claim 21, and are all patentable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Claims 3, 4 and 5

Claims 3 and 5 each recite “then the public key is discarded.” Although claims 3 and 5 have been repeatedly amended, the phrase “and then the public key is discarded” has been present in claims 3 and 5 as originally filed. The Office action, in the rejection under § 112¶1, appears to imply that the term ‘discard’ requires further description in the specification to specify exactly how or to clarify the steps of how the public key is discarded. Merriam–Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition, 2003, Merriam–Webster Inc., states that ‘discard’ means to “get rid of [especially] as useless or unwanted”. Exactly how or the steps of discarding or getting rid of data from memory is known by one of skill in the art. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under § 112¶1 of claims 3 and 5 (and dependent claim 4) be withdrawn.

Claims 14, 15, and 16

Claim 14 recites “then discarding the public key and first network address.” Although claim 14 has been amended, the phrase “then discarding the public key and

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

first network address” has been present in claim 14 as originally filed. Similar to the rejection of claims 3 and 5 above, the Office action, in the rejection under § 112¶1, appears to imply that the term ‘discard’ requires further description in the specification to specify exactly how or to clarify the steps of how the public key and first network address are discarded. As noted above, the term discard is defined as ‘getting rid of’ and how to get rid of data in a computing device is known by one of skill in the art. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under § 112¶1 of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claim 15 recites “then removing from the cache the public key/network address association” and claim 16 recites “removing the public key/network address association from the cache.” Although claims 15 and 16 have been amended, the rejected phrases concerning removal of the public key/network address association have been present in the rejected claims as originally filed. Similar to the rejection of claims 3 and 5 above, the Office action, in the rejection under § 112¶1, appears to imply that the phrase ‘removing from the cache’ requires further description in the specification to specify exactly how or to clarify the steps of how the public key/network address association is removed from the cache. Merriam-Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition, 2003, Merriam-Webster Inc., states that ‘remove’ means “to get rid of: ELIMINATE”, which is identical in meaning to ‘discard’ as discussed above. Similar to the discussion above with respect to claims 3 and 5, how to get rid of data or associations between data is known to one of skill in the art. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under § 112¶1 of claims 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8

Claims 6 and 8 each recite “the portion of the network address other than the node selectable portion being defined by a network address protocol.” The specification

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

states at paragraph [0032] that “Modern network addresses, such as those used in IPv6, are composed of two parts. The first part, called the route prefix 308 contains a routable address that can be used to route a message to an appropriate network link.” The specification continues in paragraph [0033] with “the sending device sends the second part of its PKD [Public Key–Derived] address. This part is called the “node–selectable” portion 312 because the sending device is free to set this part as it sees fit.” The specification continues in paragraph [0041] with “In an IPv6 unicast address, this [node selectable] portion is 62 bits long (excluding the “u” and “g” bits whose values may not be set by the sender).” In this manner, a network address may have two portions: a node–selectable portion and a portion of the network address other than the node selectable portion, which in the given example of IPv6 contains the route prefix and the “u” and “g” bits, although other protocols may be suitable and use other phrases to describe or indicate the portion other than the node selectable portion of the network address. Applicant believes that that one of skill in the art would recognize the term “portion of the network address other than the node selectable portion being defined by a network address protocol” as being the portion of the network address that is not the node selectable portion as defined by a network address protocol, such as IPv6. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection under § 112¶1 of claims 6–8 be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 8 also recite “comparing a portion of a value produced by the hashing with a portion of the network address other than the node–selectable portion.” Although claims 6 and 8 have been amended, the rejected phrase concerning comparing a portion of the value produced by the hashing with a portion of the network address other than the node–selectable portion has been present in the rejected claims as originally filed. The Office action, in the rejection under § 112¶1, appears to imply that the term ‘comparing’ requires further description in the specification to specify exactly

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

how or to clarify the steps of how the value is compared to a portion of the network address. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 11th Edition, 2003, Merriam-Webster Inc., states that 'compare' means "to examine the character or qualities of [especially] in order to discover resemblances or differences." How to compare data is known by one of skill in the art.

Moreover, with reference to the method of Figure 4, the specification states in paragraph [0041] that "Then, as an additional part of step 408, compare two bits of the hash value to the "u" and "g" bits." As noted above, the "u" and "g" bits are portions of the network address other than the node selectable portion of the network address. Thus, the specification includes an example description of comparing a portion of a value produced by the hashing with a portion of the network address other than the node-selectable portion, as recited in claims 6- 8. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under § 112¶1.

Claims 9-10

The rejection of claims under § 101 included a general statement that claims 9 and 10 were rejected. However, the Office action did not specify which portion(s) of claims 9 and 10 were rejected. Thus, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection under § 101, or at least an indication from the Examiner as to which portion(s) of claims 9 and 10 are rejected.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration and reexamination of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: 12/29/05

By: 

Carole A. Boelitz, Reg. No. 48,958
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 722-6035
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

December 29, 2005
Date


Signature

Rimma N. Oks
Printed Name

Type of Response: Response
Application Number: 10/010,352
Attorney Docket Number: 171135.02
Filing Date: 11/13/2001